Taluk; Amble Anniah Pandit, Mysore District Board; Moulvi Dervish Peer, Anjuman-i-Himayath-Islam, Mysore; and others.

The idea embodied in the Regulation is repugnant to all the notions on which the devolution of property according to Hindu Law is based. A son who did not worship his father's gods could not claim his property as the Hindus believe that it should descend only to those heirs who would keep up the family custom. The position of the convert was very illogical as he wanted only the benefits of his inheritance without the corresponding obligations. Further the cases of conversion are very rare and do not justify legislation against the unanimous opinion of the public. The proposed legislation is inconsistent with the policy of religious neutrality laid down in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, and reiterated in His Majesty's Message in 1908.

One member expressed a fear that the Regulation might be passed in spite of public opinion if the official majority voted for it, and the Dewan remarked that it was not the intention of Government to treat the measure as an official bill which the official members were bound to support. The official members would be allowed the liberty to vote according to their own individual opinions.

In response to a call from the Dewan for the views of the Mahomedan members of the Assembly, Mr. Dervish Peer said that the Koran disinherited all converts and that even a convert to Islam lost all his pre-Islamic rights. The Mahomedans were against the proposed measure and joined the rest of the Assembly in protesting against it.

Mr. Pilkington, who was invited to express his opinion, stated that he recognized that there was a strong body of public opinion against the measure; but Hinduism, more than other faiths, was always tolerant of other beliefs. The present law interfered with liberty of conscience and was unworthy of the best traditions of Hinduism. He thought that a child's birth-right should not be taken away simply on account of a change of religion, but the father had a full right to will away his personal property from the son, if so disposed.

One of the members stated that there was not a single person in the Assembly who would support the measure; and the whole Assembly stood up as agreeing with the statement.

*Reply of Government.*—Noted.

SUBJECT No. 10.

Introduction of the *Khaji* Act.

Messrs. Moulvi Dervish Peer, Anjuman-i-Himayath Islam, Mysore; G. Abdul Khalig, Chikmagalur Municipality; and Oosman Khan, Bangalore City Municipality.

*Summary of discussion.*—The *Khaji* Act now in force in British India may be introduced into the State. The existing *Khajis* are not well versed in religious matters.

*Reply of Government.*—The matter will be considered after obtaining further opinions.